

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 13-42 and 44 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 13, 28, and 44 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§102 Rejection of Claims 13-15, 18-26, 28-30, 33-41 and 44

In Section 3 of the Office Action, claims 13-15, 18-26, 28-30, 33-41 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Windows, copyright 1998, Screenshot 1 (hereinafter referred to as “Windows Screenshot”).

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that “if the user wants to get access to services of a specific home device, a session manager generates an interface displaying a loaded top level home page of the respective home device with reference to said home device buttons. ... Further, it is to be noted that each top-level home page for a respective home device has a different structure according to different operating functions associated therewith. Hence, the user has to concentrate on different structures of distinct top-level home pages, respectively.” *Background of the Specification, page 5, lines 23-30.*

To address the above-described problem, embodiments of the present invention provide method and interface for controlling network devices. For example, the steps of method claim 13 includes:

“*determining* a connection of one or more devices to a network;

determining availability of one or more multimedia services available via one or more devices connected to the network; and

displaying a hierarchical view representative of said one or more devices connected to the network and said one or more available multimedia services related thereto.”

(emphasis added)

In summary, claim 13 describes a method for controlling network devices by determining which devices and multimedia services are available and connected to a network, and displaying a hierarchical view of the connected devices and available multimedia services related to the devices. Figure 1 of the present application, which is substantially reflected in claim 13, illustrates one example of an integrated hierarchical view that includes representations of both devices (e.g., PCs 17-18, servers 19-20, and multimedia devices 25-26) and multimedia services (e.g., CD tracks 24a-24c and broadcast channels 43a-43g).

Although Windows Screenshot shows a hierarchical view of the logical and physical devices connected to a computer, Windows Screenshot fails to show multimedia services such as CD tracks and broadcast channels.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is maintained that claim 13 should be allowable over Windows Screenshot. Furthermore, since independent claims 28 and 44 closely parallel, and include substantially similar limitations as recited in, independent claim 13, claims 28 and 44 should also be allowable over Windows Screenshot. Since claims 14-27 and 29-42 depend from claims 13 and 28, respectively, claims 14-27 and 29-42 should also be allowable over Windows Screenshot.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 13-15, 18-26, 33-41 and 44 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 16-17 and 31-32

In Section 4 of the Office Action, claims 16-17 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

- §103(a) as being unpatentable over Windows Screenshot, as applied to claims 13 and 28 above, and Battat *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,985,012; hereinafter referred to as “Battat”).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claims 13 and 28, and since claims 16-17 and 31-32 depend from claims 13 and 28, respectively, it is maintained that claims 16-17 and 31-32 should be allowable over Windows Screenshot.

Further, it was stated in Section 4 that Battat teaches “a user interface that provides a visualization and management of connected components of a computer network in a tree-like structure (Battat et al.: column 4, lines 47-59; column 16, lines 46-50 and Figure 10B)” and further teaches “integrating sub-networks and various components of the network via bridges (Battat et al.: column 18, lines 52-65)”.

Therefore, based on the foregoing discussion, it is maintained that Windows Screenshot and Battat, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 13 and 28, and by extension, claims 16-17 and 31-32.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 16-17 and 31-32 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 27 and 42

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 27 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Windows Screenshot, as applied to claims 13 and 28 above, and Saito *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,523,696; hereinafter referred to as “Saito”).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claims 13 and 28, and since claims 27 and 42 depend from claims 13 and 28, respectively, it is maintained that claims 27 and 42 should be allowable over Windows Screenshot.

Further, it was stated in Section 5 that Saito teaches “an interface that displays information regarding interconnected devices and services in a network (Saito et al.: column 15, lines 18-30; column 22, lines 41-65 and Figures 5 and 13)” and further teaches “the use of AV/C protocol for controlling components (Saito et al.: column 3, lines 58-67 and column 13, lines 49-56)”.

Therefore, based on the foregoing discussion, it is maintained that Windows Screenshot and Saito, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 13 and 28, and by extension, claims 27 and 42.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 27 and 42 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 13-42 and 44 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of

PATENT

Appl. No. 09/901,275

Attorney Docket No. 450117-03255

patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Samuel S. Lee
Reg. No. 42,791
(858) 731-0500